commanded. Therefore you are hereby commanded that the said goods and chattels so as aforesaid taken you expose to sale and the money there from arising you have before the said court of Appeals to be held at the City of Annapolis on the second monday in June next to render unto the said Benjamin H Mullikin the damages costs and charges last aforesaid and all such costs as have accrued on the said writ of fieri facias and how you shall execute this writ you make appear unto the said Court of Appeals at the place and on the day aforesaid and have you then and there this writ witness the Honorable Jeremiah Townley Chase Esquire Chief Judge of the said court of Appeals the second day of December in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty two

Issued the 6th day of January 1823.

(J Johnson Jr) (Th. Harris clk

Which said Writ of Venditioni Exponas was thereon endorsed as follows to wit: Damages $1000 Current money costs $6.83⅓ Court of Appeals costs $10.72 additional costs $4.48. To be released on payment of two thirds part of $459.25 Current money with interest on $459.35 from the 1st of February 1814 till paid and $3.$\frac{38}{100}$ additional costs. And now at this day, to wit, the said second Monday in June being the ninth day of the said month, in the year of our Lord one thousand eight hundred and twenty three and the return day of the foregoing writ, comes into the Court of Appeals here the said Benjamin H Mullikin by his Attorney aforesaid; and the Sheriff of Prince Georges County aforesaid, to whom the said writ was in form aforesaid directed, to wit, Thomas Osbourn gentleman, makes return thereof to the Court here, thus endorsed, to wit: made one hundred dollars nulla Bona the residue

Thomas Osbourn Shff

Test (Th. Harris Clk

13

Matthias Bartgis vs Casper Mantz Exor of Francis Mantz	Be it remembered, That now here on the first Monday in December being the second day of the said month, in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and twenty two the Chief Judge and associate Judges

of the fifth Judicial district of Maryland, in pursuance of the directions of the act of assembly in such case made and

provided, transmit to the Court of Appeals here the record of proceedings which was lately depending before them in the County Court of Frederick between Francis Mantz complainant, and John Boyer and Matthias Bartgis defendants, and wherein the said County Court passed a decree for the said Francis Mantz against the said John Boyer and Matthias Bartgis and from which said Decree the said Matthias Bartgis appealed to the Court of Appeals here, the tenor of which said record of proceedings is in form following, to wit:

Maryland, Frederick County Set.

At a County Court sitting as a Court of Equity, began and held at the Court house in Frederick Town, in and for said County on the first monday of July in the year of our Lord, one thousand eight hundred and twenty two –

Present –

The Honorable Abm Shriver Esquire
Associate Judge –

Thomas W. Morgan Sheriff and
John Schley Clerk.

Among others were the following proceedings (to wit) –

Francis Mantz vs John Boyer & Matthias Bartgis	Be it remembered that heretofore to wit, on the twenty seventh day of may eighteen hundred and nineteen, came Francis Mantz into Frederick County Court sitting as a Court of Equity by Roger

B Taney Esquire his Solicitor and exhibited his Bill of complaint against John Boyer & Matthias Bartgis in the words following to wit,

To the Honourable the Judges of Frederick County Court, sitting as a Court of Chancery. – The Bill of complaint of Francis Mantz of Frederick County respectfully sheweth that John Boyer of Frederick County being indebted to the said Mantz in a large sum of money as more fully appears by his certain Bill obligatory herewith exhibited marked No. 1. to which the complainant refers, and prays that the same together with the other exhibits, hereinafter referred to, may be taken as a part of this his bill of complaint, and the said Mantz being also security to a certain Francis Hartz for the payment of a large sum of money due, to him from the said John Boyer. He the said John Boyer in order more effectually to secure the payment of the money due from him to the said Mantz. And also, to save the complainant from any